

# **SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

**UPDATED 2014**

## ***Purpose of checklist:***

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

## ***Instructions for applicants:***

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

## ***Instructions for Lead Agencies:***

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

## ***Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:***

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

## **A. background**

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Amendments to the Land Use Code to modify standards related to pedestrian access of sidewalks.

2. Name of applicant:

City of Seattle

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

City of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections  
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1800  
P.O. Box 34019  
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Contact: Eric Engmann, (206) 256-5518, [eric.engmann@seattle.gov](mailto:eric.engmann@seattle.gov).

4. Date checklist prepared:

May 1, 2018

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections.

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

The proposed code amendments will be reviewed by City Council and discussed in a public hearing in mid-2018.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

No, the proposal is a non-project action that is not dependent upon any further action.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

A SEPA environmental checklist, environmental determination, Director's Report, and related information are prepared for this proposal.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

This is a non-project action. The proposal's effect would be citywide where development is on-going. It would affect future development in commercial, industrial, and residential zones. However, it would only affect future development activities where sidewalks are already required by code under SMC 23.53.006, such as for the dedication of new streets, lot creation through platting process, and development abutting a street without a sidewalk within urban centers and urban villages. Currently, several kinds of projects are exempt from sidewalk requirements under SMC 23.53.006.F, such as changes of use, alterations to existing structures, additions to existing structures that are exempt from environmental review, construction of a detached structure accessory to a single-family dwelling unit, and construction of a single-family dwelling unit on a lot. Under this proposed amendment, projects listed as exempt from installing sidewalks will not be required to install curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings. No changes are proposed for the types of development listed as exempt from the sidewalk requirement under SMC 23.53.006.F.

Under this proposal, development projects that are already required to installed sidewalks would also need to install curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings. Curb ramps and accessible crossings will only be required for lots abutting the block ends (corner lots). They will not be required for lots not abutting the block ends (interior lots).

In addition, in the urban villages and urban centers, if future development is proposed abutting existing sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings that do not comply with the City of Seattle's Right-of-Way Improvements Manual (ROWIM), they would need to be modified or replaced. This requirement would only be for full and short subdivisions and developments that abut existing streets. Unit lot subdivisions and construction projects exempt from installing sidewalks would not need to meet this requirement.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

The proposed amendments require approval by City Council. No other agency approvals are anticipated.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

This is a non-project legislative action proposing amendments to the Land Use Code. The proposal aims to increase accessibility on pedestrian networks, especially for those individuals with mobility disabilities. The proposal would change the Land Use Code to require curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings when new sidewalks are already required as part of development projects. In addition, in the urban villages and urban centers, if development is proposed abutting existing sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings that do not comply with the City of Seattle's ROWIM standards, they will need to be modified or replaced. This requirement would only apply to full and short subdivisions and developments that abut existing streets. Unit lot subdivisions and construction projects exempt from installing sidewalks will not need to meet this requirement.

The proposed amendments would:

- Include language that curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings need to meet the ROWIM and ADA standards (SMC 23.53.006.A);
- Add curb and curb ramp installation when sidewalks are required for development projects (SMC 23.53.006.B, C, D, E);
- Include a new provision in 23.53.006.C that for development projects in the urban villages and urban centers, if development is proposed abutting existing sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings that do not comply with the City of Seattle's ROWIM standards, they will need to be modified or replaced. This requirement would only be full and short subdivisions and developments that abut existing streets. Unit lot subdivisions and construction projects exempt from installing sidewalks will not need to meet this requirement;
- Add a new provision that if a pedestrian pathway without a curb is installed, then an accessible crossing, instead of a curb ramp is needed (SMC 23.53.006.F);
- Include curb ramps and accessible crossings as street use improvements that can be required for development projects in residential (SMC 23.53.015.A), commercial (SMC 23.53.015.A), and industrial zones (SMC 23.53.020.A); and
- Add "accessible crossing" (SMC 23.83A.002) and "curb ramp" (SMC 23.83A.006) to the definition section of the Land Use Code.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

This is a non-project action. The proposal's effects would be citywide where development is on-going or would occur in the future. It would affect future development in commercial, industrial, and residential zones. However, it would only affect future development activities where sidewalks are already required under SMC 23.53.006, such as the dedication of new streets, lot creation through platting process, and development abutting a street without a sidewalk within urban centers and urban villages. See other information in response to questions A.9 and A.11 above.

## **B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

### **1. Earth**

#### **a. General description of the site**

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other \_\_\_\_\_

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. Citywide topography includes flat, hilly, and steep slope areas.

Any future project-specific actions related to this code amendment would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

#### **b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?**

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. Slopes of varying steepness are located throughout the City of Seattle.

#### **c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.**

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. Citywide soil conditions include a wide variety of glacially-influenced soils, clay, sand, peat, and other soil types in different parts of the city.

#### **d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.**

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

#### **e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.**

This non-project proposal has no particular development site, and has no particular proposal for excavation, filling, grading or related adverse effects. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of possible indirect effects.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site, and has no particular proposal for clearing or construction. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of possible indirect erosion impacts.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site, and has no particular proposal for clearing or construction. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of possible indirect impervious surface impacts. Any future project-specific actions related to this code amendment would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

This non-project proposal has no particular development site, and has no particular proposal for clearing or construction. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of possible indirect impervious surface impacts and proposed measures to reduce or control erosion. Any future project specific actions related to this code amendment would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way. Any future projects would have to comply with standards found in the ROWIM.

## 2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of potential indirect emissions impacts.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

None are proposed. This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of potential indirect emissions impacts.

## 3. Water

- a. Surface Water:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site, and no such work is identified.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site, and no such work is identified.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

The non-project proposal has no particular development site.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site, and no construction is proposed. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of potential indirect impacts related to water quality.

b. Ground Water:

- 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

None identified.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of potential indirect impacts on stormwater runoff.

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

- 3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

None proposed. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for a discussion of regulations already in place.

**4. Plants**

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

- ☒\_X\_deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other  
☒\_X\_evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other  
☐\_Scrubs  
☒\_X\_grass  
☐\_\_\_\_pasture  
☐\_\_\_\_crop or grain  
☐\_\_\_\_Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.  
☐\_\_\_\_wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other  
☐\_\_\_\_water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other  
☒\_X\_other types of vegetation

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. Citywide vegetation patterns include greenbelts and urban forest, and including trees, grass, and other vegetation on individual properties.

Any future project-specific actions related to this code amendment, would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

None. This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.2 later in this checklist for discussion of potential indirect impacts to vegetation.

- c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None known. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

None. This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.2 later in this checklist.

- e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

None known. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

## 5. Animals

- a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site. Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other: crows, pigeons, starlings, gulls and other urban tolerant birds

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: squirrels, rodents, raccoon, household pets, and other similar mammals tolerant to urban environments

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other \_\_\_\_\_

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. Seattle is relatively highly urbanized in its development patterns, but it also has a variety of retained greenbelts, hillsides, stream and river environments where plant, animal, fish and marine habitats are present. As well, wildlife habituated to urban areas and fragmented vegetated areas in the city, such as squirrels, opossum, coyotes, a variety of bird species including eagles, are present. See the response to Question #D.2 later in this checklist.

Any future project specific actions related to this code amendment would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

- b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None known. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

Seattle is in the Pacific Flyway. This non-project proposal has, however, no particular development site.

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

None proposed. See the response to Question #D.2 later in this checklist for a discussion of regulations in place.

- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

None known.

## 6. Energy and natural resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site and will not impact the energy sources of new development.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties?  
If so, generally describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. Indirect effects of the proposal will not generate the potential for height/bulk/scale concerns of existing or future buildings and is thus unlikely to affect solar energy access.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal?  
List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

This non-project proposal has no particular development site, and no features or measures are proposed.

## 7. Environmental health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

No.

- 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist.

- 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

None. This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist.

- 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist.

- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist.

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

None proposed. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

None. This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

None. This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for discussion of potential indirect impacts of noise.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

None proposed. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for a discussion of regulations in place that could require mitigation for impacts to environmental health from any future installation of curbs, curb ramps, accessible crossings.

**8. Land and shoreline use**

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the response to Questions #D.5 later in this checklist for more discussion of potential land use impacts.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or no forest use?

No.

1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

No.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. The proposal modifies regulations related to pedestrian networks located in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. The proposal modifies regulations related to pedestrian networks located in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. The proposal's potentially affected area would be citywide, including properties with zoning in commercial, industrial, and residential zones. See the response to Question #D.5 later in this checklist.

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site; the city as a whole has numerous comprehensive plan designations.

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. See the responses to Questions #D.1, #D.2, #D.4, and #D.5 later in this checklist.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site. Environmentally critical areas are located throughout the City of Seattle. See the responses to Question #D.4 of this checklist for discussion of procedures to mitigate any indirect impacts to critical areas.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

None. This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: \_

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

See the response to Questions #D.5 and #D.7 later in this checklist for discussion of compatibility of the proposed legislation with existing and projected land uses and plans.

- m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

None proposed.

## 9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. The proposal would not result in the creation of any new housing units.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. This proposal would not directly result in the elimination of any housing units.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

None proposed.

## 10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. Also, the proposal is not identified to have any particular implications for height/bulk/scale of buildings.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

None proposed.

## 11. Light and glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

No.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

None proposed.

## 12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. The proposal would result in increased accessibility to pedestrian networks by the installation of curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings. See the response to Question #D.6 later in this checklist.

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

None proposed.

## 13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. See the response to Question #D.4 later in this checklist.

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. See the response to Question #D.4 later in this checklist.

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. See the response to Question #D.4 later in this checklist.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

None proposed.

## 14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. This is a non-project legislative action proposing amendments to the Land Use Code. The proposal is aimed to increase accessibility on pedestrian networks, especially for those individuals with mobility disabilities. The proposal would change the Land Use Code to require curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings when new sidewalks are already required as part of development projects throughout the city. In addition, in the urban villages and urban centers, when there is development proposed abutting substandard sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings per the ROWIM, they will need to be modified or replaced. This requirement would only be for full and short subdivisions and developments that abut existing streets. Unit lot subdivisions and other types of construction projects currently exempt from installing sidewalks would continue to not need to meet this requirement.

Any future project specific actions related to this code amendment, would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

The sidewalks and pedestrian pathways abuts the existing street systems. During the construction of the sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings there could be temporary impacts to the public streets in the immediate vicinity of where the work on the pedestrian networks is occurring. See the response to Question #D.6 later in this checklist for the evaluation of the relationship of the transportation implications of the proposal.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

This is a non-project legislative action proposing amendments to the Land Use Code with no particular site. However, it would affect a wide range of areas that include many transit-served areas. The proposal aims to increase accessibility on pedestrian networks, especially for those individuals with mobility disabilities, which would aid accessibility to transit systems.

Any future project specific actions related to this code amendment, would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way. Based on 2016 permit data from Seattle Department of Transportation, there were around 170 new construction permits on corner lots not located in the single-family zone. Depending on the economy, it is anticipated that a similar number of projects would be required to install curb ramps.

For sidewalks and pedestrian pathways abutting the existing street systems, during construction of the sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings, there could be temporary vehicle-access impacts to the public streets in the immediate vicinity of where the work on the pedestrian networks is occurring. Additionally, during construction, there could be temporary access-related impacts to the pedestrian networks leading to bus stops. Once completed, accessibility on pedestrian networks would be improved, especially for those with mobility disabilities. See the response to Question #D.6 later in this checklist.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

This is a non-project legislative action proposing amendments to the Land Use Code with no particular site. The proposal aims to increase accessibility on pedestrian networks, especially for those individuals with mobility disabilities. See the response to Question #D.6 later in this checklist.

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

The City maintains inventories on sidewalk and curb ramp assets that include details on the type of construction materials and features. In Seattle, there are over 34,000 blocks of improved sidewalks, totaling over 2,300 miles. However, many streets in Seattle do not have sidewalks. As of December 2017, there were approximately 800 miles of unimproved surfaces and 4 miles of gravel surfaces. The Seattle Department of Transportation, private developers, and other agencies construct sidewalks. Approximately 20% of all new sidewalks installed between 2009 to 2015 were built as part of private development projects or improvements provided by other public agencies. As of December 2017, the city's curb ramp inventory includes approximately 30,000 curb ramps. Seattle has around 40,000 sidewalk ends that do not have curb ramps. However, not every sidewalk end requires a curb ramp.

In the Urban Center and Urban Villages there are approximately 11,400 blocks of improved sidewalks. Of those sidewalks, approximately 4,800 blocks are not compliant with the ROWIM engineering dimensions. In the Urban Centers and Urban Villages, there are approximately 10,400 curb ramps. Of those curb ramps, approximately 10,000 are not compliant with the current ROWIM. As projects come in for permitting, developers will work with the Seattle Department of Transportation to determine options to bring sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings into compliance with the ROWIM.

Any future project specific actions related to this code amendment, would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way. Based on 2016 permit data from Seattle Department of Transportation, there were around 170 new construction permits on corner lots not located in the single-family zone. Depending on development trends, which may be affected by national and regional economic trends, it is anticipated that a comparable number of projects would be required to install curb ramps annually.

See the response to Question #D.6 later in this checklist for additional information.

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or specific development associated with it. See the responses to Questions #D.6 later in the checklist for evaluation of the relationship of the SEPA transportation impact implications of the proposal.

- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

No. This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. See the responses to Questions #D.6 later in the checklist.

#### 15. Public services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. Through increased access on sidewalks this increase the accessibility to public services. See the response to Question #D.6 later in this checklist.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

None proposed.

#### 16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:  
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,  
other \_\_\_\_\_

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development.

### C. Signature

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: On file  
Name of signee Eric Engmann  
Position and Agency/Organization Senior Planning and Development Specialist,  
SDCI  
Date Submitted: May 17, 2018

### D. supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

(IT IS NOT NECESSARY to use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

The proposed changes would result in no direct impacts, and are unlikely to result in significant indirect or cumulative adverse impacts related to water, air, toxic/hazardous substances, or noise. The proposal is a non-project action.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. This is a non-project legislative action proposing amendments to the Land Use Code. Any future project specific actions related to this code amendment, would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

The proposal does not alter any procedures or regulations related to natural environment protections. Any project-specific action that would add curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings that is above adopted thresholds for review would be subject to environmental review under the proposal.

The new curb, curb ramps, and accessible crossings would be added in conjunction with development activity that is already required to install sidewalks. While construction of these features would generate degrees of noise and air emissions in their immediate vicinity during the installation process, the potential for meaningful adverse differences between impacts of a project with and without curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings—in terms of emissions and noise—is likely to be minimal. Given the close similarity between improvements with and without these features, there would be no adverse change generated in terms of consistently different water drainage effects, erosion-related effects, air quality emissions, toxic/hazardous substance emissions, or noise impacts. It could also be possible that installing curbs would assist in more effectively directing or containing stormwater drainage than if curbs were not present.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None proposed. Applicable regulations, including the Land Use Code, Stormwater Code, SEPA regulations, Environmental Critical Areas Code, Shoreline Master Program Code, Floodplain Development Code, Noise Ordinance, and environmental protections found in the ROWIM, are anticipated to adequately mitigate any potential adverse impacts of future associated project-specific actions.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The proposed changes would result in no direct impacts and are unlikely to result in significant indirect or cumulative adverse impacts related to plant, animal, fish or marine life.

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development. This is a non-project legislative action proposing amendments to the Land Use Code. Any future project

specific actions related to this code amendment, would occur in the City of Seattle's right-of-way.

The proposal does not alter any procedures or regulations related to natural environment protections. Any project-specific action that would add curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings that is above adopted thresholds for review would be subject to environmental review under the proposal.

The new curb, curb ramps, and accessible crossings will be added in conjunction with development activity that is already required to install sidewalks. Given the close similarity between improvements with and without these features, there would be no probable significant adverse change generated in terms of different impacts upon plant, animal, fish, or marine life, or habitats or related environments.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None proposed. Applicable regulations, including the Land Use Code, Stormwater Code, SEPA regulations, Environmental Critical Areas Code, Shoreline Master Program Code, Floodplain Development Code, Noise Ordinance, environmental protections found in the ROWIM are anticipated to adequately mitigate any impacts of any future associated project-specific actions.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The proposed changes would result in no direct negative impacts, and are unlikely to result in significant indirect or cumulative impacts related to energy or natural resources. This is a non-project legislative action proposing amendments to the Land Use Code. The proposal aims to increase accessibility on pedestrian networks, especially for those individuals with mobility disabilities.

By increasing the accessibility to pedestrian networks, especially, those with mobility disabilities there is a potential for the proposed code amendments to conserve energy and/or natural resources through a reduction in the use of low-occupancy motor vehicles in favor of using pedestrian networks, thereby potentially having a positive impact on those resources.

The proposal does not alter any procedures or regulations related to natural environment protections.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

None proposed.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

The proposed changes would result in no direct adverse impacts, and are unlikely to result in significant indirect or cumulative adverse impacts related to protected environmental areas.

Given the close similarity between future required improvements with and without the implementation of this proposal, there would be no probable significant adverse change generated in terms of different impacts upon these kinds of environmentally sensitive areas. Of these types, in Seattle there would be occasional possibilities that future sidewalk curb and crossing improvements of the proposed kind would occur in the general vicinity of parks, and potential for wetland, natural stream or ditch environments to be present relatively nearby. But it is relatively unlikely that net differences in adverse impacts upon these features due to the proposal would occur.

Any future project specific actions related to this code amendment, would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way. While it may be unlikely to occur given past improvements in the right-of-way, there would still be a possibility that unknown cultural resources would be unearthed during construction activities related to the proposal. If so, activities would be subject to established rules pertaining to this situation, including but not limited to guidance indicated in Director's Rule 2-98.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None proposed. Applicable regulations, including the Land Use Code, Stormwater Code, SEPA regulations, Environmental Critical Areas Code, Shoreline Master Program Code, Floodplain Development Code, Noise Ordinance, historic preservation rules, Director's Rule 2-98 and related guidance, and environmental protections found in the ROWIM are anticipated to adequately mitigate any impacts of any future associated project-specific actions.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposed changes would continue to allow land uses compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposal would not alter the development capacity or the zoning of any properties or the used allowed in any zone, and is not expected to alter the pace or scale of new development.

The proposal would not alter any procedures or regulations related to the Seattle Shoreline Master Program and would not alter allowances for development that could otherwise occur in or near shoreline areas under existing regulations.

The potential for impacts on land use is likely to be mostly positive. At a minimum, construction of more curb ramps and accessible crossings would likely make existing pedestrians feel safer due to the demarcating and physical benefits of curbs themselves. In the long term, it is hoped the number of people using the pedestrian walkways will steadily increase. In turn, more pedestrian traffic would be likely to contribute toward creating safer and more vibrant communities, economic diversity within mixed-use areas, and less dependence on the automobile for mobility needs.

Under the ROWIM, when a curb ramp or accessible crossing is installed to serve one end of a crosswalk, it needs to be matched by another curb ramp or accessible crossing at the other end of the crosswalk, if there is not an existing curb ramp or accessibility crossing. This additional curb ramp or accessible crossing is known as a companion ramp. Installing the companion ramp allows for an individual with a mobility disability to enter the street from the sidewalk, cross the street, and access the sidewalk on the other side. The requirement to install a companion ramp depends on the site-specific conditions, existing infrastructure, and curb radius. Installing companion ramps could also trigger the need to install companion ramps on the remaining block ends of the intersection. This requirement would also depend on specific conditions, existing infrastructure, and curb radius.

Although less likely, the amendments could potentially generate adverse effects on land use in terms of possible incremental increases in the cost of housing if the costs of curbs, curb ramps, accessible crossings, or companion ramps are passed on to the consumer by the builder, or if the pace of housing development might slow down in response to these new requirements.

The proposed changes would require curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings only when sidewalks are already required. Additionally, the curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings will only be required for lots abutting the block ends (corner lots). They will not be required for lots not abutting the block ends (interior lots). The time when new sidewalks are being constructed is the easiest and most affordable time for curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings to be installed.

### Curb Ramps and Accessible Crossings

Currently, the Land Use Code requires sidewalks for several development activities such as the dedication of new streets, lot creation through platting process, and development abutting a street without a sidewalk within urban centers and urban villages. Conversely, several types of development projects are not required to construct sidewalks, such as changes of use, alterations to existing structures, additions to existing structures that are exempt from environmental review, construction of a detached structure accessory to a single-family dwelling unit, and construction of a single-family dwelling unit on a lot. Under this proposed amendment, projects listed as exempt from installing sidewalks would still not be required to install curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings. In other words, no changes are proposed for the types of projects listed as exempt from the sidewalk requirements.

The proposed amendment would add curb ramps and accessible crossings to the list of possible required street improvements. Additionally, with some development projects a pedestrian pathway, instead of a sidewalk, is proposed to be required. Or, with some development projects, there might be an already-existing pedestrian pathway. Pedestrian pathways do not have curbs. Under the proposed changes to SMC 23.53.015 and SMC 23.53.020, an accessible crossing would be required instead of a curb ramp when there is a pedestrian pathway.

### Urban Centers and Urban Villages.

The proposed code amendments to the Land Use Code would require new development that has existing sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings to comply with the ROWIM standards. If the existing sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings do not comply with the standards, mobility could be limited for some people to these pedestrian walkways. In the urban villages and urban centers, if development is proposed abutting existing sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings that do not comply with the City of Seattle's ROWIM standards, those features would need to be modified or replaced. This requirement would only apply to full and short subdivisions and developments that abut existing streets. Unit lot subdivisions and construction projects exempt from installing sidewalks would not need to meet this requirement. The improvement of the sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings will allow for increased accessibility to pedestrian corridors including those with mobility disabilities.

The proposal would support the following Comprehensive Plan goals and policies:

T 2.11 Design sidewalks in urban centers, urban villages, and areas designated as pedestrian zones in the Land Use Code to meet the dimensional standards as specified in the Right-of-Way Improvements Manual to foster vibrant pedestrian environments in these areas;

T 2.2 Ensure that the street network accommodates multiple travel modes, including transit, freight movement, pedestrians, people with disabilities, bicycles, general purpose traffic, and shared transportation options;

TG 3 Meet people's mobility needs by providing equitable access to, and encouraging use of, multiple transportation options; and

T 3.21 Design and manage the transportation system, including on-street parking, so that people with disabilities have safe and convenient access to their destinations, while discouraging use of disabled parking permits for commuter use in areas of high short-term parking demand.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

This non-project proposal has no particular development site or development associated with it. This is a non-project legislative action proposing amendments to the Land Use Code. The proposal aims to increase accessibility on pedestrian networks, especially for those individuals with mobility disabilities. The proposal would change the Land Use Code to require curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings when new sidewalks are already required as part of development projects throughout the city. In addition, in the urban villages and urban centers, when there is development proposed abutting substandard sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, and accessible crossings per the ROWIM standards, they will need to be modified or replaced. This requirement would only be full and short subdivisions and developments that abut existing streets. Unit lot subdivisions and construction projects exempt from installing sidewalks will not need to meet this requirement. As such, the proposal would lead to progressive improvement of the city's transportation system's coverage and accessibility available within the city. This would represent a positive form of transportation impact. The implementation of the proposal would not generate adverse demand-increase related impacts.

Any future project-specific actions related to this code amendment, would be in the City of Seattle's right-of-way. Based on 2016 permit data from Seattle Department of Transportation, there were around 170 new construction permits on corner lots not located in the single-family zone. Depending on the development trends, which may be affected by national and regional economic trends, it is anticipated that a comparable number of projects would be required to install curb ramps annually.

The proposed changes could mean that better pedestrian networks would encourage more people to use sidewalks to reach transit stops. While representing an increased demand for use of the infrastructure, this possible outcome is not likely to significantly adversely affect transportation networks or operations. This proposal would reduce barriers to those with a mobility disability to use pedestrian networks, a positive type of transportation impact.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

None proposed.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The proposal is believed to not result in conflicts with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for protection of the environment.

This proposal will result in the City of Seattle being in more compliant with state and federal laws. Under federal and state regulations, when new sidewalks are constructed, curb ramps must be installed. The ADA, 28 CFR 35.151 (i)(1), states “newly constructed or altered street level pedestrian walkways must contain curb ramps or other sloped areas at intersections to streets, roads, or highways.” The Revised Code of Washington, 35.68.075, states “the standard for construction on any county road, or city or town street, for which curbs in combination with sidewalks, paths, or other pedestrian access ways are to be constructed, shall be not less than two ramps per lineal block on or near the crosswalks at intersections.”